



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/473,988	12/29/1999	TOSHIKAZU INOUE	991493	1714

23850 7590 06/04/2003

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP
1725 K STREET, NW
SUITE 1000
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

DOAN, THERESA T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2814

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/473,988

Applicant(s)

INOUE ET AL.

Examiner

Theresa T Doan

Art Unit

2814

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 04 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: 2, 4, 7 and 9.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1, 3, 5, 6, 8 and 20.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____


Ngan Van Ngo
Primary Examiner

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

1) Claims 2, 4, 7 and 9 are now allowed.

2) Applicant argues on pages 1-2 that Taniguchi et al. disclose "an H content of $(\text{HSiO } 3/2)_n$ before curing would have a value of 28.6 atom%" and does not disclose "any condition with respect to curing on which the H content would be not less than 15.4 atom %". The argument is not persuasive because Taniguchi et al. clearly teach in figure 1, column 6, lines 20-24 that "organic films may be used for the SOG film 2. Instead of organic films, an inorganic material including ... Hydrogen Silsesquioxane $(\text{HSiO}_3/2)_n$ may also be used in place of the SOG film 2."; an inorganic material including $(\text{HSiO}_3/2)_n$ is a final product, therefore, "an H content of $(\text{HSiO}_3/2)_n$ before curing would have a value of 28.6%" is not truth. Applicant's argument about "an H content of $(\text{HSiO } 3/2)_n$ before curing would have a value of 28.6 atom%" is not supported by Taniguchi. Applicant is requested to show where the teaching of "an H content of $(\text{HSiO } 3/2)_n$ before curing would have a value of 28.6 atom%" in Taniguchi. However, Taniguchi teaches a first insulating layer 2 has an H content of not less than 15.4 atom % in the composition $(\text{HSiO}_3/2)$ (see column 6, lines 20-24). Furthermore, the limitation of "an H content of $(\text{HSiO } 3/2)_n$ before curing would have a value of 28.6 atom%" does not recite in the claimed language. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).